

REMARKS

I. Summary of Office Action

In the Final Office Action mailed December 15, 2010, the Examiner rejected claims 13, 15-22, 24-36, 38-41, 52-53, 55 and 56.

Claims 13, 17, 19-22, 25, 27-32, 36, 39-40, 52-53, 55 and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Susskind, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0046366 ("Susskind") in view of Piersol et al., U.S. Patent 7,386,599 ("Piersol") in view of Franco, U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0046407 ("Franco").

Claims 15-16, 18 and 33-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susskind, Piersol and Franco in view of Paroz, U.S. Patent 6,587,125 ("Paroz").

Claims 24 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susskind, Piersol and Franco in view of Cao, U.S. Patent 6,782,550 ("Cao").

Claims 26 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susskind, Piersol and Franco in view of Venkatraman, et al., U.S. Patent 5,956,487 ("Venkatraman").

II. Status of Claims

Pending are claims 13, 15-22, 24-36, 38-41, 52-53, 55 and 56 of which claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 are independent and the remainder are dependent.

III. Response to 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 13, 17, 19-22, 25, 27-32, 36, 39-40, 52-53, 55 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susskind in view of Piersol in view of

Franco.

The Examiner rejected claims 15-16, 18 and 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susskind, Piersol and Franco in view of Paroz.

The Examiner rejected claims 24 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susskind, Piersol and Franco in view of Cao.

The Examiner rejected claims 26 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susskind, Piersol and Franco in view of Venkatraman.

Applicants' presently claimed "integrated presentations" includes information from "both stored on the media-based device . . . and originating from third-party online sources of information and services." Specification, para. 13. The specification explains the information "both stored on the media-based device" and "originating to from unrelated online sources" are "combined into an integrated presentation." Specification, para. 13. Applicants' claimed "integrated presentations" are thus *integrated* because they combine information from "third-party search engines and other online content-providers" providing additional information such as "content, broadcast, show and movie clips, chat rooms, etc. . . ." with existing information, functions, features and services. Specification, para. 108.

The Examiner's rejection acknowledges, "Susskind and Piersol do not specifically teach the claimed integrated presentation. Instead, the Examiner cites Franco as forming Applicants' presently claimed "integrated presentations," specifically citing paragraph [0069].

A. Independent Claims 13, 27, 52, 53, and 55 Are Allowable as Franco Does Not Disclose The Claimed "Integrated Presentation"

Paragraph [0069] of Franco, however, does not disclose an "integrated presentation" of broadcast programming, movie clips, chat rooms as in Applicants' present claims. The cited passage does not disclose an integrated presentation in description of Fig. 2B. Nothing in Fig.

2B discloses an integrated presentation. As seen below, it only shows a conventional program guide grid, i.e., "provided by TV Guide Online."

Clickable Programming Page – Click on the programs you wish to record

Your TV Listings For Feb 15

	9:00 PM	9:30 PM	10:00 PM	10:30 PM
2 KCBS	60 Minutes II		Judging Amy (TV-PG)	
3 COMMTV	<< Community Television >>			
4 KNBC	Will & Grace (TV-PG)	Will & Grace (Repeat)	Dateline NBC	
5 KTLA	Angel (TV-PG)		News	
6 ESPN	Celebrate the Dream	Greatest Sports Legend	SportsCenter	
7 KABC	Shanna & Greg (TV-PG)	Drew Carey (Repeat)	NYPD Blue	
8 USA	<< Westminster Kennel Club Dog Show			
9 KCAL	News		News	
10 CNN	Larry King Live		CNN News Stand	
11 KTTV	<Who Wants to Marry a Multi-Millionaire? (TV-PG)			
12 MTV	Total Request Live	Tom Green	Tom Green	Lyricist Lounge
13 KCOP	Shasta	Dilbert	News	
14 HN	Headline News>>			
15 A&E	Biography (TV-G)		Investigative Reports	
16 LIFE	A Mother's Instinct (TV-PG, NR)			
17 QVC	Eterna Gold		Linen Outlet	
18 KSCI	News	Gag Concert in Korean	Heathful Living	Kingdom of the Chosen
19 KABC	Brady Bunch	Beverly Hillsbillies	All in the Family	Jeffersons

UPDATE PAGE

TRANSMIT

Go To Program Schedule Page

Logout

FIG. 2B

Thus, Franco does not disclose an “integrated presentation” as in the presently pending claims. Accordingly, independent claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 are allowable. Because dependent claims 15-22, 24-26, 28-36, 38-41 and 56 depend from one of the allowable independent claims, they are allowable for the same reasons as well.

B. Independent Claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 Are Further Allowable as the Prior Art Does Not Disclose an “API” To Provide The Integrated Presentation “Distinctive to The Web Portal”

Independent claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 are also allowable for an additional reason. The cited prior art references, including the newly cited Franco, make no mention of the claimed Application Programming Interface or “API” that “provides each of the one or more integrated presentations distinctive to the web portal configured to provide a variety of online services comprising email, news and web search capability.” Claim 13.

Applicants’ specification teaches that it is this claimed “API” that “enables clients on the network computing system to request and to obtain the integrated presentation at the client user interfaces in unique arrangements distinctive to the local environment of the web portal.” The claimed “API encapsulates a variety of function that facilitate creating a user account, user login, user preferences, adding a request, obtaining programming guide information, finding television programs of interest, and others . . .” Specification, para. [0016].

The cited references make no mention of the claimed “API” or “integrated presentation.” Rather, Susskind only teaches “the HTML pages are in effect a simulation of the Video Recording Device 20.” Susskind teaches the webpage as particular to the Video Recording Device, but is absent any teaching adapting “unique arrangements *distinctive to the local*

environment of the web portal” as taught by Applicants’ specification in paragraph 16 and claimed by independent claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55.

Accordingly, independent claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 are allowable for this independent reason as well. Because dependent claims 15-22, 24-26, 28-36, 38-41 and 56 depend from one of these allowable independent claims, they are also allowable for the same reasons.

IV. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that, in view of the remarks above, each of the pending claims 13, 15-22, 24-36, 38-41, 52-53, 55 and 56 are allowable. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of the current rejections and indication of allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-2134 with any questions or comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 15, 2011

/George I. Lee/
George I. Lee
Reg. No. 39,269